

MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Members of the Town of Smithfield Town Council and School Committee

From: Smithfield Financial Review Commission

Subject: Fall 2013 Report

Date: May 14, 2014

In November 2013, the Smithfield Financial Review Commission (FRC) presented its Fall report to the Smithfield Town Council following the creation of FRC liaison positions with each of the four town municipal departments and a full commission review of each of the departments between January and November 2013. In that report, the Commission advised the Town Council of its support for the \$6.4M bond requested by the Smithfield Police Department.

On January 28, 2014, the Smithfield Town Council and the Smithfield Financial Review Commission held a joint meeting. In that meeting, it was decided the FRC would focus on the capital requests of the School Department, Fire Department and the Greenville Library. Accordingly, we respectfully submit the Spring 2014 report providing the analyses and recommendations from the Smithfield Financial Review Commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve the citizens of Smithfield.

Respectfully,

Smithfield Financial Review Commission
Rose Marie Cipriano, Chairperson
Mirek Kula, Vice Chairperson
Kenneth J. Sousa, Secretary
Joseph Passaretti
Roger Warren
Corissa Bernier, Alternate



**Smithfield Financial Review Commission
Final Report
May 14, 2014**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 1

SMITHFIELD SCHOOL DEPARTMENT.....2

 Background.....2

 Problem.....3

 Recommendations.....3

FIRE DEPARTMENT4

 Background.....4

 Problem.....5

 Operational Impact5

 Financial Impact6

 Recommendations.....6

GREENVILLE LIBRARY7

 Background.....7

 Problem.....8

 Financial Impact9

 Recommendations.....9

EXHIBITS 11

 Exhibit A – School Department CIP 12

 Exhibit B – Saccoccio & Associates Letter 13

 Exhibit C – RIDE Letters to Superintendent 17

 Exhibit D – Library Comparison by Community 20

Financial Review Commission Report

May 14, 2014

Executive Summary

The Town Council and Financial Review Commission met in joint session on January 28, 2014 to review the scope of the FRC Spring Report.

The FRC Chair and Vice Chair met with the School Department leadership on January 31, 2013 to discuss deadlines for validated information and to review a priority list of capital items. On March 22, 2014, the Smithfield Financial Review Commission met with the Superintendent and Buildings/Grounds Director, Assistant Superintendent and representatives from the School Committee. Among the items discussed, the report by Saccoccio & Associates regarding the status of the roofs on the High and Middle schools.

After analyzing all data provided to the FRC, there is no objective evidence of any safety and health issues that require immediate attention by the Town and School Department. Therefore, the FRC concludes that there is insufficient supporting information necessary to provide the Council with a financially prudent recommendation for the School Department's request for a 2014 bond initiative.

The Commission reviewed materials added to the original data by the Smithfield Fire Department supporting its request for inclusion in a 2014 bond initiative. The FRC liaisons met with the Fire Department leadership to discuss and review external funding sources available to the Department.

While the Department has provided a detailed project request, the FRC believes that a comparative analysis of various alternatives needs to be completed. These alternatives should include the various construction and land acquisition costs as well as the service expectation impact and resulting benefits associated with each alternative. Such comparative analysis of additional alternatives is needed to ensure that a prudent financial recommendation can be derived in the context of service expectations. In addition, a "*do nothing*" alternative should be considered to evaluate all actionable alternatives to a baseline.

Therefore, at this time, the FRC cannot provide any specific recommendations on the Fire Department's request for additional funds.

The Director and members of the Board of Trustees of the Greenville Library presented to the FRC their building expansion proposal. After careful consideration of the information provided in their presentation, the FRC has concluded that the issue of two independent libraries needs to be addressed in the larger context of the totality of library services in Smithfield.

Therefore, the FRC does not recommend inclusion of the Greenville Library in the 2014 Bond initiative.

SMITHFIELD SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

Background

The School Department differs from the other municipal departments in that Capital Improvements are part of the overall annual budget request subject to Town approval. The annual budget request includes a Capital Improvement line item of \$250,000. The six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) contains all capital expenditure requiring items that the School Department anticipates during that time frame. By budgeting funds annually, the School Department has been able to complete various projects with costs exceeding the annual capital improvement funds.

The School Department's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), as submitted on August 19, 2013, totaled \$10.9M. Subsequently, their CIP prioritized list was reduced to \$7.3M, as shown in Exhibit A. The FRC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson met with the School Department leadership on January 31, 2014 to focus on the School Department's two most important priorities listed: High School and Middle School roofs. Cost estimates included in the CIP for these projects are at least two years old.

Currently, both the High School and Middle School roofs are no longer covered by their respective warranties, which expired in 2009 and 2005 respectively. Roof systems if constructed with current technologies, could include a 20-year warranty covering defects in materials. Additionally, several repairs have been performed on the roofs in order to address issues due to normal wear and tear.

Discussions included a possible State housing grant that would help recover some costs over the life of the bond payments associated with these two school roofs. From this meeting, it was determined that the School Department representatives were unaware of a moratorium associated with the RIDE State Housing Grant Program. However, the FRC cautions that approval for such a grant is subject to legislative, fiscal and other circumstances. Accordingly, there is no guarantee of any grant approval and resulting reimbursement of funds.

At the January 29, 2014 FRC meeting, the Financial Review Commission voted to establish a deadline of February 13, 2014 for accepting any information to be included in its Spring 2014 report. At the January 31, 2014 meeting, the School Administration leadership was informed of this deadline in order to be considered for inclusion in the Spring 2014 report.

In March 2014, the FRC received information prepared by Saccoccio Associates and, accordingly, could not address it for inclusion in this report. This report is included in Exhibit B. In their report, it states that, "Given the condition and age of the roofs along with the potential health and safety hazards associated with roof failures that the School Department replace the roof system as soon as possible" (High School and Middle School).

At the April 3, 2014 FRC meeting, the Town Manager and Finance Director addressed statements made by School Department leadership in their March 22, 2014 presentation to the Commission. The FRC expressed concerns regarding RIDE's Stage II requirements for the State Housing Grant. Specifically, the Commission posed the concern that if the required architectural review of school buildings determined that other capital improvements were determined to be

Financial Review Commission Report

May 14, 2014

categorized as “health and safety issues,” the replacement of the school roofs may not be reimbursed by RIDE. FRC was informed that the prioritization of improvement projects is based on an inspection, analysis and feasibility study by an independent architectural expert.

The terminology compiled in the Saccoccio report discusses the existence of problems needed to be addressed for “potential health and safety” reasons. However, the report did not stipulate “immediate” urgency or a need for completion by a specific date. Furthermore, the Town Manager and Finance Director have reviewed photographs of the roofs provided by the School Department and identified them as taken some time ago and indicated repair work in some of these areas has already been completed. It should be noted that while the roof replacements have been listed on the School Department’s CIP list for several years, at no time during any FRC-School Department meetings prior to January 31, 2014 were these roofs discussed or identified as a priority need.

After its April 3, 2014 meeting, the FRC received a copy of a letter sent by RIDE (as shown in Exhibit C) to the Superintendent granting Stage I approval for a RIDE State Housing grant (see related April 4th email). RIDE has stated that the District’s “*Stage II submission will require certification by building professionals of the immediate health and safety nature of the proposed scope of work.*”

Problem

At the time of this report, the information to objectively identify problems is insufficient and incomplete. However, the following issues are noted:

- At no time prior to late January 2014 were the Middle and High School roof replacement issues identified as priority items.
- Required documentation related to the roofs was not received by the FRC by the submission deadline.
- The School Department leadership did not remain informed about RIDE grants and programs.
- Work to ensure Stage I continuation of the grant should have been addressed by the Smithfield School Department in order for objective financial and engineering feasibility information to be presented to the FRC.
- Furthermore, the School Department could then have completed the Stage II requirements by the FRC’s February 13, 2014 deadline to provide any and all information needed for bond consideration.

Recommendations

At this time, and until independent supporting documentation is provided, the FRC does not support recommendation of the School Department request for a bond item to replace the High and Middle School roofs. Ultimately, there is no objective evidence of any safety and health issues that require immediate attention by the Town and School Department.

The FRC recommends careful completion of Stage II requirements in the RIDE Housing Aid grant process within the one-year period from the approval by RIDE.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Background

The Smithfield Fire Department (SFD) provides emergency fire and rescue services to the Town residents and its visitors. Most of the SFD activity consists of responding to medical emergencies and accidents (70% of calls) that almost always require a trip to a hospital; and responding to fire related incidents (30% of total calls; with 10% being real fires).

The SFD also participates in the “*mutual aid*” arrangement for the Northwest region of the State that provides for aid from neighboring municipalities when local units are already engaged on a call. The out of Town mutual aid is net negative for the Town of Smithfield, that is Smithfield provides more help than it receives (by a factor of about 200 calls per year – approximately 5% of Smithfield SFD activity are mutual aid calls).

When SFD responds to a medical emergency it charges the insurance carrier of the patient/victim for the service. SFD management has represented that it collects about \$1.1M per year as a result of this reimbursement.

Smithfield has a disproportionately large and growing elderly population (as compared to other local communities in the state), which is another strong demand driver for EMS services in Town.

The most important metric for the quality of EMS services is the rescue call response time. The SFD’s goal is to have all calls responded to within ten minutes, with 90% responded within 4-6 minutes. The medical standard for maximum rescue response time is ten minutes (based on the fact that after ten minutes the probability of reviving/saving a heart attack victim decreases dramatically).

While the resident population of The Town of Smithfield is approximately 22,000, the estimated daytime population expands to approximately 35,000-40,000. Therefore, the SFD serves a larger population than it appears. This has to do primarily with the population of students, such as those at Bryant University and workers at major employers such as Fidelity Investments. Therefore, the increase in the daytime population occurs mainly in the northeast quadrant of the Town; specifically, the area furthest from existing fire stations. The increased population in the northeast quadrant is particularly taxing on the SFD resources in order to respond to medical and accident-related calls.

Smithfield SFD facilities have not undergone substantial renovations or upgrades in many years. The oldest buildings date back to the 1930s and none meet the modern standards of quality and efficiency.

The current infrastructure of the Smithfield Fire Department includes three locations as follows:

- Station 1 serves as Fire and Rescue Headquarters. Located at 607 Putnam Pike in Greenville, it was built in 1939 by the Greenville Volunteer Fire Company. It is staffed by 2 officers and 3 firefighters, and its apparatus consists of Engine 1, Engine 4 (reserve), Medic Vehicle 1, and Boat 1. Medic Vehicle 1 is an Advanced Life Support (ALS) vehicle commonly referred to as a Rescue Truck. Medic Vehicle 1 became inoperable in the Fall of 2012 and was replaced in the Spring of 2013.
- Station 2 is located at 66 Farnum Pike, adjacent to the Town Hall. It was built in 1939 and is staffed by 1 officer and 2 firefighters. Apparatus at Station 2 includes Engine 2, Engine 3 (Reserve), Medic Vehicle 3 and Boat 2.

Financial Review Commission Report

May 14, 2014

- Station 3 is located at 15 Log Road. It was built in 1960 and expanded in 1980. Station 3 is staffed by an Officer and a firefighter and is equipped with Medic 2, Boat 3, and Ladder 1.

Problem

SFD currently maintains insufficient infrastructure that would ensure acceptable personnel working conditions and result in unsatisfactory service performance as identified below:

- Incompatibility with the current fire and rescue equipment sizes, quantity and categorical variety.
- Meeting basic operational needs (space for meetings, education, record keeping, office supplies and equipment).
- Lack of facilities to maintain staff readiness (training, exercise).
- High costs of operations (e.g. energy use efficiency).
- Lack of community outreach space.
- Inadequate female employee accommodations

Operational Impact

The dispatch area located in Station 1 (co-located within SFD HQ), the Department believes that it requires station upgrades. Designed in the 1930s, the HQ location was expected to respond to a limited number of simple calls. It originally housed a small amount of basic equipment. Since then, it expanded its importance and has been expected to respond to thousands of rescue calls for Smithfield. Consequently, the amount and complexity of equipment increased significantly without a proportional expansion of facilities. Currently, the facility now requires a variety of equipment including technology, telephone, radio systems, weather, security monitoring equipment, dispatch recording and power backup. This equipment requires additional wiring as well as accommodating work space for additional personnel.

The entire dispatch function requires a comprehensive functional redesign and equipment evaluation as well as an analysis of staff location for an efficient operation.

It is SFD belief that fire stations' deficiencies cannot be addressed without adding a new facility and a comprehensive functional repositioning of existing resources. SFD leadership has identified the following initiatives to maintain appropriate service response times and Department operational effectiveness:

- Renovating and upgrading the facilities – improving working conditions in general, as well as expanding space for training and other operational/administrative purposes.
- Expanding the facilities – address the space for staff expansion and a gradual increase in the amount and size of the equipment.
- Additional SFD infrastructure – Build a new station building closer to the northeast quadrant repositioning the Log Road facility personnel and equipment.

The historical and future trend of service performance data collected and analyzed by the SFD indicates a serious challenge to provide a satisfactory level of service quality across the Town and especially in its northeast quadrant.

Financial Review Commission Report
May 14, 2014

Financial Impact

The SFD has engaged Saccoccio & Associates Architects to estimate the costs of the proposed project(s):

<u>Station / Project Description</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Station 1 – Renovation and expansion:		
New addition to rear of building	790,500	
Interior Renovation – Dispatch/ Office	90,950	
Subtotal – Station 1		881,450
Station 3 – Renovation and expansion:		
New headquarters addition to building	1,476,000	
Interior/exterior renovations for new addition	175,000	
Subtotal – Station 3		1,651,000
New Station 4 – Construction and basic instrumentation:		
New main building	1,620,000	
New apparatus garage	877,000	
Subtotal – New Station 4		2,497,000
<i>Total Proposed SFD Renovation Project Cost*</i>		<i>\$ 5,029,450</i>

* The total cost of the proposed SFD renovation project excludes any land acquisition cost.

Recommendations

While the SFD has provided a detailed project request, the FRC believes that an effective analysis requires various alternatives be compiled. These alternatives should include the various construction and land acquisition costs as well as the service expectation impact and value benefits associated with each alternative. The additional alternatives will provide a more complete analysis to ensure that a prudent financial recommendation can be compiled along with the service expectations. In addition, it would be helpful to include a “do nothing” alternative to analyze and evaluate all alternatives to a baseline.

GREENVILLE LIBRARY

Background

The Town of Smithfield is one of nineteen Rhode Island municipalities receiving services from private libraries. The Greenville Public Library (Library) is one of two privately held, public libraries in Smithfield and was incorporated in 1882. The current facility was built at its present site in 1956 and has been expanded twice since then to a total of 14,575 sq. ft. on two levels.

The Library is recognized by the IRS as a Section 501(c)(3) public charity organization. It is operated by a ten-member Board of Trustees and retains a staff of seven full-time and 18 part-time employees. Consistent with all municipal libraries, it is regulated by the Rhode Island Office of Library and Information Services, a division of the Department of Administration.

A table of revenues and expenses for FY2013 is shown below:

<u>Revenue Source</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Town Appropriation	729,849	73.20%
State Appropriation	151,732	15.22%
Grants and Contributions	54,248	5.44%
Investment Income	20,642	2.07%
Fees and Fines	23,098	2.32%
Miscellaneous	17,459	1.75%
<i>Total -- Revenue</i>	<i>997,028</i>	<i>100.00%</i>

<u>Expenses</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Personnel Costs	646,363	63.19%
Operating Costs	299,270	29.25%
Interest and Depreciation	77,315	7.56%
<i>Total -- Expenses</i>	<i>1,022,948</i>	<i>100.00%</i>

The Library proposes to expand its building to 35,000 sq. ft., add parking for approximately 120 cars, and open an entrance/exit onto Route 116. Total project costs are estimated to be \$9,636,562 with approximately 40% in potential reimbursement by the State.

In the 58 years since the Library was established at its present site, the population of the Town has increased and library services have evolved as well. In addition to the traditional lending and reference services, libraries today operate as community centers. Children, teen and adult programs are offered, computers are available for use, and interest groups are provided meeting space. These uses require open space and information technology.

Similar space has been proposed for overcrowded stacks and the teen homework center would be separated from the adult computer lab. Group meeting space would be configured to be accessible after normal Library hours. Staff functions could be reallocated in order that no additional staff would be required to serve the expanded space.

Financial Review Commission Report

May 14, 2014

Access to and from the Library is limited to one entrance/exit onto Route 44. Crossing the eastbound lane disrupts traffic flow on Route 44 and is dangerous for Library users and Route 44 drivers alike. The proposed entrance/exit on Route 116 will require State approval and will provide both safety and convenience to all Smithfield residents.

Specific to the classes offered by the Library, a review of their website on March 2 indicates only two computer classes being offered in March. Three other classes are posted in the schedule as “*to be offered upon request*” availability. Therefore, assuming that the Library is scheduling classes based on demand, current demand for computer classes does not appear to be needed.

The data provided in the presentation did not include the delivery of library services required for the Town based on all current facilities and alternatives. The presentation points and analysis did not consider the East Smithfield Library as another alternative for delivering library services.

Upon further analysis of the data provided, a comparison of other communities should be considered. A selection of similar communities was compiled and is illustrated in Exhibit D. As shown in Table 1, the Town ranks 6th as shown (in descending order of population). The information provided in the table is consolidated for both branches. However, its rankings for the five metrics outlined in Table #2 places the Town between four and six in the rankings. Specifically, in terms of current infrastructure, Smithfield’s library system ranks above its capacity in relation to square feet per person (population).

Problem

The Library Director has provided several items during our interviews and his presentation to the FRC which are issues and problems with their building including:

- According to standard formulas based on population, materials, equipment and usage, the useful space of the Library is suitable for a population one-third the size of Smithfield. Statistics notwithstanding, a tour of the facility clearly shows over crowded spaces; insufficient space for storage, computer servers and supplies as well as inadequate access to the meeting rooms on the lower level. Further, the single entrance/exit onto Route 44 creates a dangerous situation for Library users.
- The elevator leading to the meeting rooms appears to be too small to serve the capacity and customer traffic for the current facility.
- The storage room used to maintain the recycling and inter-library loan bins appears to be congested with materials.
- The computer server area appears to be significantly congested with cabling, computer equipment, storage bins and filing fixtures.

Some of the following information provided has not been supported with objective data.

The Library may need infrastructure improvements to the cabling, electrical and storage areas. During the presentation, no detailed information was provided on the cost of upgrading current infrastructure improvements to the Library. In order for the FRC to proceed with any objective analysis and recommendations, the following questions require additional clarification:

Financial Review Commission Report
May 14, 2014

Financial Impact

The following costs were provided by the Library management and trustees on January 29, 2014:

<u>Expense Type</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Construction	7,398,375
Professional Services	663,301
Furniture & Equipment	857,000
Loan Repayment	200,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>9,118,676</i>
Contingency Reserve	517,886
<i>Net Project Cost</i>	<i>9,636,562</i>

It is proposed that the project is funded by general obligation bonds totaling \$9.6M. According to the Library management and trustees, the State of Rhode Island could reimburse the Town for approximately \$3.9M. In addition, they represented that approximately \$400K could be raised through grants and fundraising. While the projected net project cost would be \$5.7M (pending potential State reimbursement), it is noted that the full amount borrowed and the total debt service would impact the Town's bonding and budgeting capacity.

Recommendations

The Greenville Public Library is providing quality services in a challenging and ever-changing environment for the delivery of information services and courses. The Internet and self-service information depositories (online databases, library consortiums, subscription services, etc.) have changed the delivery and strategy of information dissemination and distribution.

In order to utilize limited funding resources effectively, the Town should evaluate its delivery of all library services in a more centralized and strategic approach. The existence of two branches in the Town needs to be explored in relation to the services provided and needed by its patrons. In addition, if the demand for expanded or additional services is desired by the Library's patrons, alternative delivery methods and models should be explored and analyzed.

In order for the FRC to proceed with any objective analysis and recommendations, the following issues should be addressed:

- Has the Library explored and researched alternatives to reduce costs by implementing an off-site web hosting service?
- Are there any details associated with infrastructure improvements to the building, electrical and elevator improvements?
- Has all available storage space been utilized to store materials? Are all of the storage materials required for immediate access? Can other Town facilities be used to store some equipment and materials?
- Can the additional entrance/exit on to Route 116 be constructed and financed through other sources?
- Are two separate and independent libraries needed in Smithfield?

- Are there duplicative services offered?
- Is there a lack of “economies of scale” by providing duplicate services?
- Due to the autonomy, independence and State statute, can the delivery of library services and infrastructure (buildings, materials, labor and services) be more effective and efficient through a consolidated library organization?
- Has a current assessment of the assets and services been completed for all Town libraries?

While the Library provided some statistics during the presentation, additional data is needed.

- Specifically, a data collection initiative completed by an outside entity which would include either a focus group and/or survey as follows:
 - An evaluation of current services by Library patrons.
 - An evaluation of services which are not offered by the library system and desired by current Library patrons.
 - For non-patrons of either library within the Town, an evaluation of awareness of current library services offered; rationale why they do not use services (what are their sources, if needed, for information).
- Additional detailed information relating to:
 - Number of classes, programs or seminars completed, sessions conducted and number of participants (by session).
 - The computer usage was provided as a number without any context (24,010). It is unclear how much usage (in time) that these visits or uses represent.
- Alternatives to services and program delivery:
 - Can the library infrastructure and assets be shared and utilized by the Library system to reduce costs while providing current services?
 - Are Smithfield residents aware that they may utilize Bryant University for library services? Is it used? Is there any data to support its usage (or lack of)?
 - Can the Bryant University library provide additional services while reducing (or re-allocating resources) associated with the Town’s library system?
 - Can computer and education classes be offered at the Smithfield School Department’s facilities to expand offerings while maintaining current building infrastructure?

While the library system could improve services by expanding the existing facility in Greenville, the FRC believes that the expansion of information and educational services could also be achieved with a consolidated and centralized approach to the delivery of library services.

Therefore, at this time, the FRC cannot recommend this proposal for funding. We would recommend that the Council engage a comprehensive, independent feasibility study on the delivery of library services to answer the questions that we have provided.

EXHIBITS

**Financial Review Commission Report
May 14, 2014**

Exhibit A – School Department CIP

**SMITHFIELD SCHOOL DEPARTMENT
Capital Improvement Program
March 26, 2014**

		Bond	Capital	Total
Masonry repairs/engineering costs for Old County chimney	School committee will address through regular capital funds		15,000	
Replace roof shingles at Winsor	School committee will address through regular capital funds		75,000	
Repave William Winsor parking lot, replace sidewalks and curbing	May be addressed by state		175,000	
Repave Old County parking lot, replace sidewalks and curbing	School committee will address through regular capital funds		179,622	
Repave High School parking lot, (replace sidewalks), curbing and street light	School committee will address through regular capital funds		225,000	
Repave Middle School parking lot, replace sidewalks, curbing and street light	School committee will address through regular capital funds		200,000	
Repave McCabe parking lot, (replace sidewalks) and curbing	School committee will address through regular capital funds		175,000	
Replace windows at LaPerche with thermal units and screens	School committee will address through regular capital funds		500,000	
Replace Middle School roof	Bond	1,950,000		
Replace roof/chimney at Smithfield High School	Bond	3,600,000		
Replace roof at Administration building (includes abatement costs)	Bond	243,450		
Total Major Projects		5,793,450	1,544,622	7,338,072

**NOTE: These projects will be prioritized by the School Committee over the next five years based upon recommendations of health and safety issues made in the feasibility study.

Exhibit B – Saccoccio & Associates Letter



SACCOCCIO & ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTS

March 7, 2014

Angelo Mencucci
Smithfield School Department
49 Farnum Pike,
Smithfield, RI 02917

RE: Smithfield School Department Roof assessment
Smithfield Senior High School
Vincent J. Gallagher Middle School
Smithfield School Administration Building

Dear Angelo,

On Friday February 28, 2014 I conducted a review of the roofs at the High School, Middle School and Administration building. The purpose of our visit was to evaluate the condition of the existing roofs and masonry chimney. Based on our review make recommendations for repair and / or replacement. Please note this was a visual review of the roofs and at the time of our visit the roofs had snow on the surface. Therefore we did not review the entire roof surface. In addition to our visual review several roof cores were taken to at various locations to determine the existing roof makeup. Based on our visit the summary of our review is as follows.

Smithfield High School:

Observations – Main Roof:

The existing roof on the main building was installed in 1998. The roof is a GenFlex TPO with a 10 year warranty that has since expired in 2009. The roof was installed over the existing tar and gravel roof assumed to be the original roof on the building. The roof structure is pitched to provide a positive pitch to all of the roof drains.

All roof sections are ballasted, except for the science wing.

- There are multiple active leaks traveling inside the building envelope. The water infiltration may have lead and/or will lead to such issues as mold, mildew, property damage, slip and falls, energy loss through wet/collapsed insulation, and premature roof system failure.
- Low flashing heights are consistent on all roof sections that were inspected. This includes the thru-wall details and curbs on all penetrations. The flashing heights should be a minimum 8" above the roof surface and no higher than 24"
- A majority of the skylights are not being used for functional purposes and are the immediate cause of some leaks. Need to be removed.
- There is structural slope in the roof deck.

- Splits and open conditions are present along many of the flashings.
- The membrane has significant shrinkage/ballooning which has caused the membrane to fail: delaminating and tenting along the perimeter, causing the membrane to pull away from the raised metal edge leaving the system more susceptible to leaks.
- There are some mechanical units that are not properly flashed as they are just sitting on wood blocking on the roof. Not up to code and not good roof practice as this could void a warranty (assuming that the roof was still in warranty).
- The expansion joints have failed. Poor detailing and installation.
- The masonry is good condition, overall.
- The chimney and small section that was repaired over the courtyard hallway area are the exceptions. In this case masonry repairs are recommended.
- The core samples taken revealed a consistent roof design of 2.5" polyisocyanurate insulation, 4 play tar and gravel roof, TPO roofing and ballast.

Recommendations:

Given the condition and age of the roof along with the potential health and safety hazards associated with roof failures that the school department replace the roof system as soon as possible. Based on the current energy codes and RIDE standards this would be a complete removal and replacement of the existing system. To meet the new standards the new roof will require an R-25 insulation value. The new insulation and roofer will require new flashing and the existing roof units, vents and fans to be raised.

Science Wing Addition:

The science wing was roof went into service 2005. The roofing system is a Carlisle Golden Seal Total Roofing System. Wit a .06 EPDM Membrane. The system carries a 15-year warrantee and the roofing material carries a 20-year warrantee. The total system warrantee will expire April 2019 and the material warrantee in December 2024.

Recommendations:

Continue the maintenance of the roof and schedule a replacement sometime after the warrantee period is expired.

Gallagher Middle School.

Observations:

Based on the records reviewed the Middle school roof warrantee expired in 2005. The roof system consists of a combination of fiberglass insulation and polyisocyanurate insulation with varying thickness between 2" and 3 ¼" depending on location. The roof sheet is an EPDM Mechanically fastened roof system. The structural steel system is pitched in most areas and provides a positive pitch to the roof drains.

- There are multiple active leaks
- Low flashing heights on curbs and thru-wall counter flashings.
- Expansion joints have failed.
- Multiple repairs to a majority of the seams that have previously failed.
- Obsolete solar that was improperly installed.
- Membrane is pulling away from the perimeter.

Recommendations:

Given the condition and age of the roof along with the potential health and safety hazards associated with roof failures that the school department replace the roof system as soon as possible. Based on the current energy codes and RIDE standards this would be a complete removal and replacement of the existing system. To meet the new standards the new roof will require an R-25 insulation value. The new insulation and roofer will require new flashing and the existing roof units, vents and fans to be raised. The existing photovoltaic cells on the roof are no longer in service and would be removed.

Administration Building:

Observations:

Based on the records reviewed the admin building roof warrantee expired in 2011. The roof system consists 3" polyisocyanurate insulation and a coal tar pitch roof. The re-roof sheet is a TPO roof system. The wood deck is pitched and provides a positive pitch to the roof drains.

- The existing roof is showing signs of failure
- Existing seams are showing signs of wear
- The roof access has to be improved, the current wood ladder poses a safety hazard
- The copper flashing need repair and/or replacement

Recommendations:

Given the condition and age of the roof along with the potential health and safety hazards associated with roof failures that the school department replace the roof system as soon as possible. Based on the current energy codes and RIDE standards this would be a complete removal and replacement of

Financial Review Commission Report
May 14, 2014

the existing system. To meet the new standards the new roof will require an R-25 insulation value. The new insulation and roofer will require new flashing and the existing roof units, vents and fans to be raised. Along with the roof the existing copper flashing needs repair and / or replacement.

Roof Replacement Budgets:

The following estimates are based on a scope of the work that includes, a complete replacement /removal of the existing roofing, new R-25 insulation, new blocking, skylight removal and repair, mechanical units raised as required.

1.	High School main roof and masonry repair, 120,000 square feet of roofing	\$3,600,000
2.	Middle School roof, 65,000 square feet of roofing	\$1,950,000
3.	Administration Building	<u>\$ 210,000</u>
	Total	\$5,760,000

If you have any questions please let me know.

Very truly yours,



Mark Saccoccio, NCARB/AIA

Financial Review Commission Report

May 14, 2014

Exhibit C – RIDE Letters to Superintendent

Mail - response to inquiry

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=1e0e2d9511&view=pt&se...>



Rose Marie Cipriano <rosemaricipriano@gmail.com>

Response to Inquiry

2 messages

Brown, Cynthia <Cynthia.Brown@ride.ri.gov>

Fri, Apr 4, 2014 at 12:54 PM

To: "rosemaricipriano@gmail.com" <rosemaricipriano@gmail.com>

Cc: "Da Silva, Joseph" <Joseph.DaSilva@ride.ri.gov>, "Carreno, Mario" <Mario.Carreno@ride.ri.gov>, "Cordero, Manuel" <Manuel.Cordero@ride.ri.gov>

Dear Ms. Cipriano,

This email is a follow-up to our conversation earlier today. I reviewed the question you raised with Mario Carreno in our School Construction Office in an effort to provide you with as much information as possible at this time. Joe da Silva will be in the office next week so please feel free to reach out to him to address any further questions you may have. I'm copying Joe on this email and am certain that he will let you know if there is additional information that would be helpful.

The Necessity of School Construction application is a multi-staged approval process. Stage I of the process requires districts to include a statement of interest, project justification, asset protection plan, capital improvement plan, and community demographics. Smithfield recently received Stage I approval (attached).

Stage II of the process requires districts to complete a feasibility study, create cost projections, and design plans. During this stage, all needs, options, and alternatives are identified regardless of cost. Everything, including the condition of fire sprinklers, is identified and prioritized by the district. This list of projects must then receive community support including City/Town Council and School Committee. The end result is a final list of projects that will be presented to the Board of Education. RIDE works with districts to package these projects to create maximum flexibility.

A Memorandum of Agreement is then created that sets forth the dollar authorization and scope of work for each project. Bond funded projects require enabling legislation and local voter approval. The project description and dollar amount of the enabling legislation should match the Memorandum of Agreement.

Projects that do not have Board of Education approval are not eligible for reimbursement. For example, if Smithfield did not seek any fire alarm/sprinkler/code compliance upgrades as part of this approval process, these type of projects could not be added afterwards.

However, Smithfield currently has a grandfathered \$6M Board of Education approval that can be used for districtwide code compliance (sprinklers, fire alarms, etc...) upgrades. Only Capital Reserve funded projects are eligible under the old approval. This would allow Smithfield to add fire sprinklers or other upgrades even after receiving a new Board of Education approval.

F4

4/4/2014 3:16 PM

Financial Review Commission Report
May 14, 2014

I hope that this information is helpful and am confident that the feasibility study will serve to identify all of the potential areas to be addressed and provide opportunities for discussion prior to final recommendation to and approval of the Board of Regents. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Cynthia S. Brown, Director
Office of Statewide Efficiencies
RI Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
255 Westminster Street
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 222-4257
Cynthia.Brown@ride.ri.gov

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact me and destroy all copies of this message.

 **20140317_Smithfield_Stage I Preliminary Approval.pdf**
1298K

Rose Marie Cipriano <rosemariecipriano@gmail.com>
To: "Brown, Cynthia" <Cynthia.Brown@ride.ri.gov>

Fri, Apr 4, 2014 at 3:09 PM

Cynthia,

Thank you so much for helping me obtain answers to the questions we discussed. I will contact Mr. da Silva next week for a few follow up items but the bulk of my concerns have been addressed.

Rose Marie Cipriano, Chairperson
Smithfield Financial Review Commission
[Quoted text hidden]

of 4

4/4/2014 3:16 PM

Financial Review Commission Report

May 14, 2014



Deborah A. Gist
Commissioner

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

March 17, 2014

Robert M. O'Brien
Superintendent
Smithfield Public Schools
49 Farnum Pike
Smithfield, RI 02917

Dear Superintendent O'Brien:

The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) received Smithfield Public School's Stage I Necessity of School Construction Application materials on March 10, 2014 and has expedited the review of all documentation. This application represents extensive analysis of existing conditions and a significant attempt to comply with the spirit of the School Construction Regulations.

RIDE has completed its review and this letter serves as notification of Stage I Preliminary Approval and authorization to move forward with the Stage II application process. The district will have a maximum of one year to complete Stage II, which as you know is required prior to the Board of Education approval. The attached checklist and supplemental package outlines information that is required for RIDE to complete the review of the Stage II application.

The next stage is critical and it will focus on establishing a project that meets the defined needs. Because RIDE is under tremendous scrutiny over the rising costs of the school construction program, it is imperative that the documentation included in the district's application meets the requirements of the School Construction Regulations and provides a sufficient basis for the Board of Education to approve the project. During the school construction moratorium, which ends on June 30, 2014, only projects necessitated by immediate health and safety reasons will be considered. During the moratorium, the district's Stage II submission will require certification by building professionals of the immediate health and safety nature of the proposed scope of work (attached).

We offer our collaboration in the planning steps moving forward. We look forward to working with you and your district throughout the review and implementation of your project. Please contact me at (401) 222-4294 to setup a meeting with the School Building Committee and its planning team. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Joseph P. da Silva, NCARB
School Construction Coordinator

CC: Cynthia Brown, Manuel Cordero, Mario Carreno - RIDE
Enclosure

Telephone (401)222-4600 Fax (401)222-6178 TTY (800)745-5555 Voice (800)745-6575 Website: www.ride.ri.gov
The Board of Education does not discriminate on the basis of age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity/expression, race, color, religion, national origin, or disability

Exhibit D – Library Comparison by Community

Table 1: Analysis of Population and Facilities of Selected Communities

City/Town	Square Feet	Population	Registered Borrowers	SqFt Per Person	Borrowers Per Person	Branches
Coventry	10,000	35,014	12,754	0.29	0.36	1
Cumberland	55,210	33,506	16,970	1.65	0.51	1
North Providence	37,650	32,078	15,057	1.17	0.47	1
Johnston	11,000	28,769	8,286	0.38	0.29	1
Westerly	50,000	22,787	8,286	2.19	0.36	1
Smithfield	27,401	21,430	10,408	1.28	0.49	2
Lincoln	11,500	21,105	9,658	0.54	0.46	1
Scituate	13,036	20,658	5,735	0.63	0.28	2
Portsmouth	15,030	17,389	6,857	0.86	0.39	1
Barrington	30,000	16,310	14,581	1.84	0.89	1
Middletown	12,743	16,150	12,285	0.79	0.76	1
Narragansett	10,000	15,868	7,642	0.63	0.48	1
North Smithfield	6,985	11,967	3,403	0.58	0.28	1

Table 2: Analysis of Population and Facilities of Selected Communities (Ranking)

City/Town	Square Feet	Population	Registered Borrowers	SqFt Per Person	Borrowers Per Person
Coventry	11	1	4	13	9
Cumberland	1	2	1	3	3
North Providence	3	3	2	5	6
Johnston	10	4	8	12	11
Westerly	2	5	8	1	10
Smithfield	5	6	6	4	4
Lincoln	9	7	7	11	7
Scituate	7	8	12	8	13
Portsmouth	6	9	11	6	8
Barrington	4	10	3	2	1
Middletown	8	11	5	7	2
Narragansett	11	12	10	9	5
North Smithfield	13	13	13	10	12